

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT CHATTANOOGA**

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| MICHAEL ALTON HALL, |) | |
| |) | Case No. 4:24-cv-48 |
| <i>Plaintiff,</i> |) | |
| |) | Judge Travis R. McDonough |
| v. |) | |
| |) | Magistrate Judge Susan K. Lee |
| DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN’S |) | |
| SERVICES and SHONDA MISHLEK, |) | |
| |) | |
| <i>Defendant.</i> |) | |

ORDER

On August 29, 2024, United States Magistrate Judge Lee filed her Report and Recommendation (Doc. 10) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Lee recommended that Plaintiff’s complaint (Doc. 2) be dismissed and the case closed.

Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.¹ Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation, as well as the record, and it agrees with Magistrate Lee’s well-reasoned conclusions.

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s complaint is **DISMISSED** and the case is **CLOSED**.

¹ Magistrate Judge Lee specifically advised Mr. Hall that he had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive his right to appeal. (Doc. 10); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings”). Even taking into account the three additional days for service provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), the period in which Plaintiff could timely file any objections has now expired.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Travis R. McDonough

**TRAVIS R. MCDONOUGH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**